



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,570	03/25/2004	Patrick J. Dillon	PB324D2	4839

22195 7590 09/27/2006

HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.
14200 SHADY GROVE ROAD
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER

NEGIN, RUSSELL SCOTT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,570	DILLON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell S. Negin	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 536, subclass 29.1.
- II. Claims 10-12 and 23-28, drawn to an isolated polypeptide and a method of using said polypeptide with antibodies, classified in class 530 and 435, subclass 350 and 4, respectively.
- III. Claim 13, drawn to a vaccine, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.
- IV. Claims 14-22, drawn to an antibody, a hybridoma, and a kit and method of using such biomolecules, classified in class 424 and 435, subclass 130.1 and 4, respectively.
- V. Claims 29-32, drawn to a computer readable medium with sequences on it, classified in class 702, subclass 19.
- VI. Claim 33, drawn to a computer-based system for identifying fragments of uropathogenic E. coli J96 pathogenicity, classified in class 702, subclass 19.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and [II-VI] are directed to related processes and products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or

Art Unit: 1631

effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed serve different functions. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Invention I is an isolated nucleic acid molecule, which serves a function distinct from an isolated polypeptide, vaccine, hybridoma, or computer-readable media or systems. In addition the nucleic acid molecule is distinct from the method of using polypeptides with antibodies. Searching all types of molecules and methods would result in an undue search burden because of the both the divergent subject matter and the different classification indices on the Inventions.

Inventions II and [III-VI] are directed to related processes and products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed serve different functions. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Invention II is an isolated polypeptide molecule and a method of use with antibodies, which serves a function distinct from an isolated vaccine, hybridoma, or computer-readable media or systems. In addition the protein molecule and its method

of use is distinct from the method of using antibodies. Searching all types of molecules and methods would result in an undue search burden because of the both the divergent subject matter and the different classification indices on the Inventions.

Inventions III and [IV-VI] are directed to related processes and products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed serve different functions. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Invention III is a vaccine, which serves a function distinct from an isolated antibody, hybridoma, or computer-readable media or systems. In addition the vaccine is distinct from the method of using antibodies. Searching all types of molecules and methods would result in an undue search burden because of the both the divergent subject matter and the different classification indices on the Inventions.

Inventions IV and [V, VI] are directed to related processes and products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed serve different functions. Furthermore, the inventions

Art Unit: 1631

as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

While Invention IV is directed to an antibody, hybridoma and a kit and method of using such biomolecules, it is distinct from a computer readable medium or a computer based system. Searching all types of molecules, methods and systems would result in an undue search burden because of the both the divergent subject matter and the different classification indices on the Inventions.

Inventions V and VI are directed to related products and processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed serve different functions. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

While Invention V is a computer readable medium with sequences on it, Invention VI is a computer based system for identifying fragments of uropathogenics *E. coli*. These processes are distinct is that one is an object with sequence information on it while the other (Invention VI) is a system with a particular function. Because of the divergent subject matter involved with the two Inventions, searching both would require undue burden.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

SEQUENCE RESTRICTION APPLICABLE TO ALL GROUPS:

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on patentably distinct sequences. Each sequence is patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid sequence. For an elected Group drawn to nucleotide sequences, the Applicants must select a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04). It is noted that the multitude of sequence submissions for examination has resulted in an undue search burden if more than one nucleic acid sequence is elected, thus making the previous waiver for up to 10 elected nucleic acid sequences effectively impossible to reasonably implement,

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions with the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 C.F.R. 1.141 et seq. Examination will be restricted to only the elected sequence. It is additionally noted that this sequence election requirement is a restriction requirement and not a specie election requirement.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such pages must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center Number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Negin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-1083. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Andrew Wang, Supervisory Patent Examiner, can be reached at (571) 272-0811.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Yolanda Chadwick, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0514.

Information regarding the status of the application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information on the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RSN

19 September 2006

RSN
19 Sept 2006

John S. Brusca 19 September 2006
JOHN S. BRUSCA, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER